

(1) Number of Pages.....38.

(2) Date of repair.....7-2-68.

(3) Initials of the Referencer.....~~26.4.68~~

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1537.

Press
Mis.

Dated 28-10-1875 196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1537

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23th October 1875.*

No. 178. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd August 1875, No. 2,158:—

Read the following letter from G. VANSAGNEW, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 14th June 1875, No. 1,790:—

In my letter, dated 3rd May 1875, No. 1,168, I reported having suspended A. Narsimha Charri, my Head Vernacular Clerk, on account of irregularities committed by him while acting as Deputy Tahsildar of the Allur Division of the Nellore Taluq.

2. I have now the honor to submit copies of the three letters noted in the margin, wherein the Acting Special Deputy Collector brought Narsimha Charri's conduct to notice, together with their respective enclosures (with translations of the vernacular ones), each letter being further accompanied by Narsimha Charri's explanation (in original) of the circumstances therein treated of.

Dated 10th April 1875, No. 84.	margin,	wherein the Acting Special
Do. 5th May „ No. 108.	Deputy Collector	brought Narsimha
Do. 14th „ „ No. 113.	Charri's conduct	to notice, together with

3. After the flood matters were so disorganized in the flooded villages that in order to obviate the delay that would have been inevitable had the ordinary course been insisted upon, I issued orders that palmyras might at once be granted by the village officers to enable those who had lost their houses to rebuild them, and that lists thereof should be furnished by the village to the taluq officers. I was aware of the risk of this order being abused; but the emergency was great, and I trusted to the taluq officers exercising a proper check on the action of the village officers.

4. Narsimha Charri could easily have done so in the eighteen affected villages of his division, with which alone I left him to deal; but from the Acting Special Deputy Collector's letters, the Board will see that he not only exercised no check upon the cutting of trees, but that his whole line of conduct was calculated to produce the grossest abuse.

The orders that he passed, and which are quoted in full by the Deputy Collector, will, I think, leave no doubt on the minds of the Board that he was in fact the chief instigator of the unnecessary wood-cutting that took place.

5. His explanations are in my opinion wholly unsatisfactory. In fact, having no explanation to give, he falls back on the futile,—not to say impudent plea of irresponsibility,—and begs that he may be believed to have acted in good faith. This is, however, what I am unable to believe. I feel convinced that it was from corrupt motives that he demoralized the village officers and betrayed the interests of Government; and I have no alternative, therefore, but to recommend his dismissal from the public service. I am unable to say any thing favorable of his character.

—

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Copies of Acting Special Deputy Collector's letters.

—

ENCLOSURES Nos. 4 to 65.—Their enclosures.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th October 1875.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 66 to 68.—Explanations from accused.

In this letter the Collector of Nellore reports on the conduct of A. Narasimha Charri, Acting Deputy Tahsildar of Allur, and recommends his dismissal from the Government service.

2. The charges against the Deputy Tahsildar are stated in general terms in the Collector's letter. He has left the Board to gather the details from the voluminous and entirely undigested documents enclosed in his letter.

3. It appears that, after the floods of October last, the Collector authorized the free grant, on the authority of the village officers, of palmyras and wood to ryots who had lost their houses. He relied on the vigilance of the taluq officers to check abuse, and the present charge is that the Deputy Tahsildar, so far from exercising any check, was, in the Collector's opinion, the chief instigator, from corrupt motives, of the excessive felling which took place in his division under color of the Collector's order.

4. The following matters are extracted from the Special Deputy Collector's reports:—

(a.) *Chankecherlu*.—The Deputy Tahsildar reported that 100 houses had fallen; the Deputy Collector could only find nine. In the backyards were found 703 trees and 129 bundles of jungle-wood.

(b.) *Vavilla*.—At first the Deputy Tahsildar reported that only five houses were injured. He afterwards countersigned thirty-one chits for 589 palmyras. The village officers admit that they issued chits for 1,300 trees to all who wanted them, and allege the Deputy Tahsildar's orders, which he admits having issued, having, he says, been informed that the village officers were refusing to grant trees. One thousand and eighteen trees were felled by Vavilla ryots in a single village, Ponnepudi. The Deputy Tahsildar made a long stay in this village, and might easily have satisfied himself as to the actual extent of the loss, but did not do so. He says that he countersigned the chits merely to show that the Munsif's mark appended to them was genuine, the Curnam being absent. But his own previous report that only five houses had been injured ought to have excited his suspicion, when called on to sign so large a number for so large a quantity. The Deputy Collector could find only twelve houses injured in the village.

(c.) In *Dampoor*, only twelve houses were damaged, but 490 palmyras were felled.

(d.) In *Gudidaladriem*, only two houses were injured, and 150 trees were cut down.

(e.) *Talamanchi* was not affected by the floods at all. It was reported, however, that 130 houses were damaged, and the Deputy Tahsildar issued indefinite orders to the village authorities to grant trees to all who had suffered. The result was that 1,048 palmyras are admitted to have been cut, and the Government reserve jungle in the village was denuded. The Deputy Collector could find only eleven houses which had suffered from the rains; but there were large quantities of wood in every backyard, and hundreds of bandy-loads must have been cut in the jungle. The wood watcher complained to the Deputy Tahsildar that the

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th October 1875.

wood was being cut by persons who had not suffered and who had no claim; but he was told to go to the police.

(f.) *In Purini*.—The Deputy Tahsildar immediately after the flood reported that no houses were injured, and the villagers admit the fact. Yet in that village and *Indupur* large quantities of wood were cut by the villagers on a regular system and shared according to their holdings. Six hundred and seventy-four trees and 200 bundles of wood were found in the backyards by the Deputy Collector. It was said that twenty-one houses fell down in the main village at Indupur (though none were injured), and four Yanadi huts; and for these, 218 trees are admitted to have been given. The Deputy Tahsildar issued orders on the 30th November to these villages that trees should be given to all who had lost their houses, and he relies on the fact that, at the time, he reported these orders to the Collector, and that the village officers had, he states, reported losses to him. But this does not prove that his orders were proper, and the alleged reports were directly contrary to what he had seen for himself and reported soon after the flood. He had since visited Indupur twice.

(g.) In *Gogulapalli*, six houses were damaged and 200 trees cut.

(h.) Some very suspicious circumstances are reported regarding orders issued six weeks after the flood by the Deputy Tahsildar himself, for the grant of trees to a man in *Biramgunta* where no houses were injured at all. These orders were reiterated, though the Village Munsif reported that none had fallen. Eighty-nine trees were felled in the village.

5. From what is stated above, it is clear that enormous loss has been unnecessarily caused to Government, and that the concession intended for the poor and helpless has been grossly abused. The Deputy Tahsildar seems to be to a great extent responsible, though he endeavours to make out that the villagers alone were so, that his orders were in conformity with his instructions, and that, if they were exceeded, he is not to blame. But his repeated and peremptory orders that trees should be granted to those who had suffered, without any caution to the village officers to scrutinize claims, seem intended to have been misunderstood; and the fact that he was ready to receive any report of loss, however incredible with reference to what he had himself seen and reported in some cases, and that he shut his ears to hints of abuses going on, raises the gravest suspicion of his motives. Even if he acted in good faith and with misdirected zeal, he has shown himself unfit for any responsible employment. In his petition, No. 1,584, he attributes the accusations of the Deputy Collector to enmity, and revenge for charges which the Deputy Tahsildar had made against a favorite of his; and alleges that equal irregularity and abuses went on elsewhere. These are matters for the Collector to deal with. Even if true, they do not help the Deputy Tahsildar in respect of the charges brought against him.

6. The Board support the Collector's recommendation that he be dismissed the service.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th October 1875.*

No. 179.

ORDER THEREON, 28th October 1875, No. 1,537.

Miscellaneous.

THE Government observe that there
can be no room for doubt that the Col-
lector's order was grossly abused, and that

Narasimha Charri ought to have prevented the abuse; but they do not see sufficient
reason to impute *mala fides* to him, and consider that the case is not such as to call
for his dismissal.

2. It is evident, however, that Narasimha Charri is not fit to be entrusted with the
responsible duties of a Deputy Tahsildar, and he should revert to his substantive post
in the office of the Collector.

3. The Government notice with disapproval the crude manner in which the
case was submitted by the Collector.

4. The petitioner will be referred to the Collector.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Accountant-General.

Exd. W. H. French.

4/2/97

On the margin of the Board of Revenue No. 2,158.

4/1537

No. 2,158.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 3rd August 1875.

Read the following letter from G. VANSAGNEW, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 14th June 1875, No. 1,790 :—

In my letter, dated 3rd May 1875, No. 1,168, I reported having suspended A. Narsimha Charri, my Head Vernacular Clerk, on account of irregularities committed by him while acting as Deputy Tahsildar of the Allur Division of the Nellore Taluq.

2. I have now the honor to submit copies of the three letters noted in the margin, wherein the Acting Special Deputy Collector brought Narsimha Charri's conduct to notice, together with
- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Dated 10th April 1875, No. 84. | |
| Do. 5th May „ No. 108. | |
| Do. 14th „ „ No. 113. | |

their respective enclosures (with translations of the vernacular ones), each letter being further accompanied by Narsimha Charri's explanation (in original) of the circumstances therein treated of.

3. After the flood matters were so disorganized in the flooded villages that in order to obviate the delay that would have been inevitable had the ordinary course been insisted upon, I issued orders that palmyras might at once be granted by the village officers to enable those who had lost their houses to rebuild them, and that lists thereof should be furnished by the village to the taluq officers. I was aware of the risk of this order being abused; but the emergency was great, and I trusted to the taluq officers exercising a proper check on the action of the village officers.

4. Narsimha Charri could easily have done so in the eighteen affected villages of his division, with which alone I left him to deal; but from the Acting Special Deputy Collector's letters, the Board will see that he not only exercised no check upon the cutting of trees, but that his whole line of conduct was calculated to produce the grossest abuse.

The orders that he passed, and which are quoted in full by the Deputy Collector, will, I think, leave no doubt on the minds of the Board that he was in fact the chief instigator of the unnecessary wood-cutting that took place.

5. His explanations are in my opinion wholly unsatisfactory. In fact, having no explanation to give, he falls back on the futile,—not to say impudent plea of irresponsibility,—and begs that he may be believed to have acted in good faith. This is, however, what I am unable to believe. I feel convinced that it was from corrupt motives that he demoralized the village officers and betrayed the interests of Government; and I have no alternative, therefore, but to recommend his dismissal from the public service. I am unable to say any thing favorable of his character.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Copies of Acting Special Deputy Collector's letters.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 4 to 65.—Their enclosures.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 66 to 68.—Explanations from accused.

Obt. of 1875 Jyadras.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Re: Dated October 28th

Encl.

OCTOBER
Nos. 178-179.

Narsimha Charri, Acting Deputy Tahsildar of Allur in Nellore District.—With reference to his conduct in the matter of cutting trees, observing that he is unfit for the responsible duties of a Deputy Tahsildar, and directing that he should revert to his substantive post in the office of the Collector.

In this letter the Collector of Nellore reports on the conduct of A. Narasimha Charri, Acting Deputy Tahsildar of Allur, and recommends his dismissal from the Government service.

2. The charges against the Deputy Tahsildar are stated in general terms in the Collector's letter. He has left the Board to gather the details from the voluminous and entirely undigested documents enclosed in his letter.

3. It appears that, after the floods of October last, the Collector authorized the free grant, on the authority of the village officers, of palmyras and wood to ryots who had lost their houses. He relied on the vigilance of the taluq officers to check abuse, and the present charge is that the Deputy Tahsildar, so far from exercising any check, was, in the Collector's opinion, the chief instigator, from corrupt motives, of the excessive felling which took place in his division under color of the Collector's order.

4. The following matters are extracted from the Special Deputy Collector's reports:—

(a.) *Chankecherlu*.—The Deputy Tahsildar reported that 100 houses had fallen; the Deputy Collector could only find nine. In the backyards were found 703 trees and 129 bundles of jungle-wood.

(b.) *Vavilla*.—At first the Deputy Tahsildar reported that only five houses were injured. He afterwards countersigned thirty-one chits for 589 palmyras. The village officers admit that they issued chits for 1,300 trees to all who wanted them, and allege the Deputy Tahsildar's orders, which he admits having issued, having, he says, been informed that the village officers were refusing to grant trees. One thousand and eighteen trees were felled by Vavilla ryots in a single village, Ponnepudi. The Deputy Tahsildar made a long stay in this village, and might easily have satisfied himself as to the actual extent of the loss, but did not do so. He says that he countersigned the chits merely to show that the Munsif's mark appended to them was genuine, the Curnam being absent. But his own previous report that only five houses had been injured ought to have excited his suspicion, when called on to sign so large a number for so large a quantity. The Deputy Collector could find only twelve houses injured in the village.

(c.) In *Dampoor*, only twelve houses were damaged, but 490 palmyras were felled.

(d.) In *Gudidladriem*, only two houses were injured, and 150 trees were cut down.

(e.) *Talamanchi* was not affected by the floods at all. It was reported, however, that 130 houses were damaged, and the Deputy Tahsildar issued indefinite orders to the village authorities to grant trees to all who had suffered. The result was that 1,048 palmyras are admitted to have been cut, and the Government reserve jungle in the village was denuded. The Deputy Collector could find only eleven houses which had suffered from the rains; but there were large quantities of wood in every backyard, and hundreds of bandy-loads must have been cut in the jungle. The wood watcher complained to the Deputy Tahsildar that the wood was being cut by persons who had not suffered and who had no claim; but he was told to go to the police.

(f.) In *Purini*.—The Deputy Tahsildar immediately after the flood reported that no houses were injured, and the villagers admit the fact. Yet in that village and *Indupur* large quantities of wood were cut by the villagers on a regular system and shared according to their holdings. Six hundred and seventy-four trees and 200 bundles of wood were found in the backyards by the Deputy Collector. It was said that twenty-one houses fell down in the main village at Indupur (though none were injured), and four Yanadi huts; and for these, 218 trees are admitted to have been given. The Deputy Tahsildar issued orders on the 30th November to these villages that trees should be given to all who had lost their houses, and he relies on the fact that, at the time, he reported these orders to the Collector, and that the village officers had, he states, reported losses to him. But this does not prove that his orders were proper, and the alleged reports were directly contrary to what he had seen for himself and reported soon after the flood. He had since visited Indupur twice.

(g.) In *Gogulapalli*, six houses were damaged and 200 trees cut.

(h.) Some very suspicious circumstances are reported regarding orders issued six weeks after the flood by the Deputy Tahsildar himself, for the grant of trees to a man in *Biramgunta* where no houses were injured at all. These orders were reiterated, though the Village Munsif reported that none had fallen. Eighty-nine trees were felled in the village.

5. From what is stated above, it is clear that enormous loss has been unnecessarily caused to Government, and that the concession intended for the poor and helpless has been grossly abused. The Deputy Tahsildar seems to be to a great extent responsible, though he endeavours to make out that the villagers alone were so, that his orders were in conformity with his instructions, and that, if they were exceeded, he is not to blame. But his repeated and peremptory orders that trees should be granted to those who had suffered, without any caution to the village officers to scrutinize claims, seem intended to have been misunderstood; and the fact that he was ready to receive any report of loss, however incredible with reference to what he had himself seen and reported in some cases, and that he shut his ears to hints of abuses going on, raises the gravest suspicion of his motives. Even if he acted in good faith and with misdirected zeal, he has shown himself unfit for any responsible employment. In his petition, No. 1,584, he attributes the accusations of the Deputy Collector to enmity, and revenge for charges which the Deputy Tahsildar had made against a favorite of his; and alleges that equal irregularity and abuses went on elsewhere. These are matters for the Collector to deal with. Even if true, they do not help the Deputy Tahsildar in respect of the charges brought against him.

6. The Board support the Collector's recommendation that he be dismissed the service.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

H. H. H.
Acting Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with seventy-one enclosures to be returned (including three Petitions).

Copy to the Collector of Nellore.

Exd. W. H. French.

To

HIS EXCELLENCY

THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL

FORT SAINT GEORGE

OOTACAMUND.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF AMMANABOLU NARASIMHACHARI, LATE DEPUTY TAHSILDAR OF ALLUR DIVISION, NELLORE DISTRICT, IS AS FOLLOWS:—

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

1. That the Collector of Nellore has recommended to Government through the Board of Revenue, your Petitioner's dismissal from the Government service for irregularities *supposed* to have been committed in his division, *by a few Village Munsiffs who had a special authority from the Collector to grant to the distressed ryots a necessary number of palmyras according to their discretion during and after the late disastrous floods.*

2. That your Petitioner has not failed to represent to the Board of Revenue that, notwithstanding his innocent and useful service at the critical time, the Collector was pleased to accept and act upon 3 *malicious* Reports of the Special Deputy Collector, against whom and whose favorite (Peri naidu) your Petitioner had occasion to make 3 *well grounded* reports to the Collector, ~~immediately after the late disastrous floods~~ on behalf of the former (the Special Deputy Collector). This representation appears to have had no effect whatever, as your Petitioner has learnt that the Board of Revenue has simply endorsed the Collector's recommendation, and forwarded the Collector's letter for the consideration and orders of Government. Your Petitioner now ventures to lay the whole case before Your Excellency in council, with a great hope that the several points herein after mentioned may also be taken into consideration *when disposing of the Collector's letter.*

3. That Your Petitioner has served under Government for nearly 12 years, of which, he has served in the Revenue Department in the Nellore District, for 7 years in various capacities. The last situation he held in this District was that of Deputy Tahsildar and Sub Magistrate of Allur, which he held for 1 year and 2 months, *having been substantively confirmed in it.*

4. That during his tenure of the last mentioned office, your Petitioner had but one critical time—the disastrous floods & rains of October and November last—when, he could show forth to his authorities of how much service he could be both to the Government as well as the distressed ryots, whose safety was entrusted to his care. The amount of pains your Petitioner took on the occasion, the several villages visited and reported on by him, the several tank repairs, including road repairs superintended by him, and last though not least, the several difficulties (not to say of the imminent dangers to which he was more than once subjected, and the providential escapes he had when crossing rivers at their highest ebb at the most difficult & disastrous period) with which he was beset at the critical time, could be easily ascertained by Your Excellency in council, by a reference to your Petitioner's several reports to the Collector (a few

4-2-271

1840
18/0/1/1/5
CUT

6
1537

BOARD of REVENUE,
MADRAS.

1875.

21027A. 3184

PROCEEDINGS, 3RD AUGUST 1876, No. 2,158.

21027A. 3184

Encl 71
CUT

21027A. 3184

Received

14 Aug 76

AUGUST.

No. 2,158.

Narasimha Chari, A.—Acting Deputy Tahsildar of Allur in Nellore District.—Letter from Collector, reporting on the conduct of — and recommending his dismissal from public service, submitted to Government with remarks.

h:178

26/12/75 N:16/009/5
18/0/1/1/5 N:20/54/7/5

of them have even been submitted to Government) as well as the report of the Salt Deputy Collector to the Collector, in which he describes the great usefulness of your Petitioner's valuable services in the Villages affected by floods. Your Petitioner now ventures to make a particular request that Your Excellency in council will not forget to send for the Salt Deputy Collector's report abovementioned, as he is sure that it will materially aid your Petitioner in the disposal of his unfortunate case.

5. That your Petitioner eagerly wished, but in vain, that the amount of pains he took, and the valuable work he did, on the occasion, *would be personally scrutinised by the Collector* to the great advantage of your Petitioner, and not left, as has now been done, to be mercilessly scandalised by the hard-heartedness and perverted notions of a Special Deputy Collector, who preferred to cover the irregularities that were committed under his very eye, and perhaps at his connivance, by the most uncharitable course he thought it proper to adopt by maliciously reporting against, and causing to snatch away from, your Petitioner, his long and hard earned bread.

6. That your Petitioner is quite certain that, if Your Excellency in council will only peruse the Special Deputy Collector's reports as per * Margin, as well as your Petitioner's Explanations thereto, (a summary of which is given below) with that patience and impartiality, which generally characterise Your Excellency's Proceedings, particularly in cases of persons so deplorably circumstanced as your Petitioner, Your Excellency in council can come to no other conclusion than that the Special Deputy Collector's reports were purely *malicious*, while your Petitioner's conduct during and after floods was not only in perfect conformity with the orders of his superiors, but also with the emergencies of the critical time at which he was engaged. Your Petitioner, in one word, ventures to submit that, had his zeal at the critical time been displayed in another District where the work of the Taluq Officers is directly supervised by the Collector, your Petitioner's claims to promotion would have long ago been submitted for the favorable consideration of Your Excellency in council, and a calamity like the one that has just befallen your Petitioner would surely be a rarity.

7. That your Petitioner now ventures to explain as briefly as possible the several *main* charges preferred against him by the Special Deputy Collector, upon whose malicious reports, the Collector has based his recommendation of your Petitioner's dismissal.

- (1) The Special Deputy Collector complains that the village of Choukuchella was *not* affected by the recent floods or rains. It is difficult to understand this assertion as his inspection of the village was so late as in February or March. The Village officers filed before your Petitioner 2 statements, 1 for 100 houses that suffered for the floods of October, and the other, for 26 houses that suffered for the rains of November. The Special Deputy Collector himself picked up an incomplete list from the Karanam's duffer, in which more than a hundred houses are entered as having suffered. From Your Petitioner's own inspection in November last, several houses suffered, including those partly damaged, and your Petitioner had no alternative at the critical time than to depend upon the village officers for the *exact* number of houses damaged. This course was pursued in all the villages of the Nellore

Taluq even under the superintendence of the other Tahsildars. The Special Deputy Collector now questions the great number of damaged houses entered in your Petitioner's reports to the Collector, fully confiding in his own *late* inspection of the village in February or March. Your Petitioner would now most respectfully request Your Excellency in council to decide whether the *early* or the *late* inspection is the proper criterion upon which truth can be established. The Special Deputy Collector did not grant compensation for *all* houses damaged, but only to the owners of those very few, who were found unable to put up new houses without pecuniary aid from Government. In such a case, how could *his* number of houses tally with *your* Petitioner's, which included all houses both partly and wholly damaged, as well as those, the owners of which were and were not able to put up new houses without Government support. The houses in the villages are, as a rule, thatched and with mud walls. A majority of houses which partly suffered were repaired with a mixture of old and new materials, and it is therefore difficult for any one to find out the actually suffered houses; *after a lapse of 3 or 4 months*. The Special Deputy Collector appears to state that a very small number of houses only suffered in the village; and if there be an authority *now* to inspect the village, even that small number cannot be traced out purely *owing to lapse of time*. Your Petitioner did not grant any trees in this village himself, and on his own responsibility.

- II. As regards the village of Vavilla, the Special Deputy Collector appears to think that Your Petitioner himself granted several palmyras *on his own responsibility*, although a very small number of houses suffered damage. This supposition is quite ungrounded. In this village, 45 houses suffered damage, and there is an account to that effect from the Village officers to the Special Deputy Collector himself *direct*. The village ryots complained to your Petitioner that the Munsiff would not grant them palmyras although their houses were damaged; & he issued written orders to the Munsiff to grant trees for damaged houses in general. The Munsiff then sent chits to a few Munsiffs of other villages where trees could be had, *with his mark on them* as he was illiterate. The addressees returned them doubting the genuineness of the mark. This circumstance was reported to your Petitioner, who ordered the Munsiff to take the Karanam's signature as well. The Munsiff replied that the Karanam was absent at Nellore on some revenue enquiry, and this statement was proved true on your Petitioner's personal enquiry. The Munsiff then requested your Petitioner to countersign his chits in token of their having proceeded from him; & he did so *on the munsiff's responsibility*. Your Petitioner could have asked the Munsiff to wait till the Karanam returned to the village; but the noise which the distressed poor were making, was so great that he countersigned the Munsiff's chits, as he feared that, by neglecting to comfort the ryots at a time when confusion largely prevailed and when Government aid was mostly in need, he would incur the serious displeasure of his authorities. In countersigning chits, Your Petitioner had no other motive than that the distressed poor might be relieved. *If the Munsiff is not responsible for the chits (as the Special Deputy Collector appears to think,) which bear his mark, there would have been no necessity for his mark on them;*

& the munsiff does not in the least deny his own responsibility. If your Petitioner is personally held responsible for the chits countersigned by him, he would have minutely inspected every house himself i.e. he would have done the Munsiff's duty himself, and granted chits prepared in his own office *without the Munsiff's mark*. The translation of the kaifeit of the Munsiff, annexed to para 29 of the Special Deputy Collector's report No. 84 dated 10th April last, sufficiently explains for what houses your Petitioner ordered the grant of trees, how many houses fell down, and under what circumstances he countersigned Munsiff's chits. The other remarks mentioned under the head of Choukucheru, regarding the *late* inspections of the Special Deputy Collector apply to this village also.

III. The Special Deputy Collector asks, who is responsible for the loot of trees in Dumpur? When the Munsiff according to the *Collector's special orders* granted the trees *on his own responsibility* & when your Petitioner had nothing to do with it, the Special Deputy Collector, instead of holding the Munsiff responsible for the loot as he calls, chooses to come down upon your Petitioner, simply because that village is in his division. Of the force and justice of the Special Deputy Collector's objection, your Petitioner begs Your Excellency in council to judge.

IV. In his first report No. 84 dated 10th April 1875, the Special Deputy Collector alludes to the grant, by your Petitioner, of Tumma trees for *agricultural purposes*. The allusion is unnecessary, as the District order on this subject is so favorable to ryots that they may themselves cut down wood *without permission*, except that the locality where the wood is to be cut should be pointed out. Even in ordinary days, applications for wood for agricultural purposes, requiring localities to be specified, are freely granted.

In the same report, the Special Deputy Collector charges your Petitioner with having thrown difficulties in the way of the Wood Department in detecting the irregular cutting of timber. What the Wood Department wanted was, the assistance of the Police through your Petitioner. Your Petitioner did write to the Police Inspector on the subject; & is he to blame if the Police did not aid? The translation of the report of the wood watcher, annexed to Para 52 of the Special Deputy Collector's report (No. 84 dated 10th April last,) is not complete, and your Petitioner requests a reference to the report itself, in which it is stated that the Police Inspector said that he would not act up to your Petitioner's wishes.

VI. In his letter No. 108 dated 5th May last, the Special Deputy Collector is pleased to complain that your Petitioner did not report about the damaged houses in Purini and Indupur. This complaint is quite ungrounded, as paras 6 and 11 of your Petitioner's letter to the Collector No. 13 dated 30th November last, will clearly show that he did report about them. On receipt of information of damage, your Petitioner asked the Munsiffs of these two villages to grant a necessary number of Palmyras for damaged houses *as per Collector's orders*; and if the village officers are supposed to have granted a larger number, surely they are responsible. The Special Deputy Collector admits that he inspected Purini in

March. It is not improbable that houses might have suffered in *November*, but it is improbable that the Special Deputy Collector could trace out the actual damage 4 months after, that is in *March*.

VII. In his letter No. 113 dated 14th May last, the Special Deputy Collector charges your Petitioner with having granted Palmyras to one Teruvengada Charlu of Biramgunta, for a cattle shed that was damaged during the late rains. This Teruvengada Charlu pointed out to your Petitioner in Biramgunta, a cattle shed as having belonged to him, which was in a damaged state, and requested your Petitioner to grant him Palmyras for repairing it. As there are no orders that Palmyras should not be granted for damaged cattle sheds, which require as much protection as inhabited houses; as the Village officers were not living in the village, but were coming there only occasionally; as Palmyras could not be had in that Village (Biramgunta); and as Teruvengada Charlu requested your Petitioner that a Takid might be issued to the Dumpur Village officers for grant of trees to him, your Petitioner wrote to the said village officers to give him Palmyras. The Special Deputy Collector mentions in his letter No. 113 that Teruvengada Charlu stated before him (that is in your Petitioner's absence) that he owned no cattle shed. If Teruvengada Charlu's subsequent statement before the Special Deputy Collector be true, this honest ryot ought not to have applied to your Petitioner for a Takid to the Dumpur Village officers. If Teruvengada charlu means now to say that your Petitioner gave the Takid to him voluntarily, and *against his will*, he must have refused to make use of your Petitioner's Takid. Teruvengada Charlu's subsequent statement appears, therefore, to be one that was forced from him after your Petitioner's suspension from office. From Teruvengada Charlu's statement before the Special Deputy Collector, it appears that a cattle shed belonging to one Vurda Charlu, a near relative of Teruvengada Charlu, came down, and it is therefore very probable that Teruvengada Charlu must have pointed out to your Petitioner this shed as having belonged to him. Any how, your Petitioner is certain that he found a cattle shed come down in Biramgunta, and it was on the strength of this inspection that he wrote a Takid to the Dumpur Village Officers. There was no room for your Petitioner to have discredited Teruvengada Charlu's statement that the cattle shed belonged to him, as he is a Puttadar paying about 150 Rupees sist to Government, and is in a position to own a cattle shed. This very Teruvengada Charlu once again applied to your Petitioner for some trees on the ground of his house having come down, and your Petitioner referred him to the Village Officers of Biramgunta, and asked them to use their discretion in the grant of trees to him, as your Petitioner did not see the house himself. They granted him about 10 trees, and Teruvengada Charlu after availing himself of them, deposed before the Special Deputy Collector that his house did not fall down for the late rains. The Special Deputy Collector now comes down upon your Petitioner for what was done *even by the village officers*.

8. That these are your Petitioner's humble and short explanations to the main charges preferred against him by the Special Deputy Collector, whose malice against him, he ventures to explain below.

9. That perhaps at the end of December last, the Special Deputy Collector was appointed to inspect the villages affected by floods, and to grant compensation to distressed ryots. During this officer's inspection of villages in the Allur Division, there was raised a great hue every where, that a person named Perinaidu of Indukurpet, a favorite of the Special Deputy Collector, was accompanying him, among others, and was demanding money from ryots with a promise to do them some good (by means of remission of assessment, grant of trees &c.) through his influence with this officer. This hue reached your Petitioner's ears, and he set about to trace out the truth, as he could not suffer to see the ryots disturbed by this private individual also, in addition to their sufferings owing to late floods. At the end of March, he got scent of what this private individual did at Vidavalur, and the several kaifeits that he took, as Deputy Tahsildar of Allur, from the village officers besides other ryots of that village, were enough to show that this individual actually demanded money from ryots to use his influence with the Special Deputy Collector. In the kaifet given by the Munsiff of that village before your Petitioner, it is stated that the Special Deputy Collector himself asked him why he did not give him money although he sent Perinaidu to his village. It is also evident from the kaifeits of the village munsiff and the karanams that the loss of crops in that village on a rough estimate owing to floods, was about Rs. 5000. The annual sist of the village is upwards of Rs. 10,000; and although, according to the kaifeits of the village officers themselves, it is clear that the remaining Rs. 5000 may be collected in that village, it is strange to find that the Special Deputy Collector sent in a report to the Collector at the end of February (without even mending a complete remission of assessment in this village. Your Petitioner submitted Report No. 1 to the Collector dated 29th March last, closing the above kaifeits, with a view that Perinaidu's conduct might be duly noticed, & the great difference of opinion of the Special Deputy Collector in regard to loss of crop in this village, checked in time. But your Petitioner is not prepared to submit what enquiries have yet been made on his report though more than 4 months have passed away.

10. That about 2 days after the submission of Report No. 1, your Petitioner's attention was drawn to another village—Talamanchi—where it was reported that the said Perinaidu attempted to collect some money from ryots. Your Petitioner proceeded to that village, and took kaifeits from 3 ryots who deposed that Perinaidu asked them to give him a bribe. One of the 3 ryots filed before your Petitioner, a letter on 2 pieces of palmyra leaves with the signature of Perinaidu thereon, wherein it is stated that Rs. 50 should be sent to him and that he (Perinaidu) would get early orders passed with regard to trees mentioned to him the previous day. The 3 kaifeits together with the letter bearing Perinaidu's signature were sent enclosed in your Petitioner's report No. 2 to the Collector dated 1st April last.

11. That your Petitioner submitted report No. 3 to the Collector about Perinaidu's conduct in another village, Gundamma Palem. From the kaifeits taken by your Petitioner in this village, it is very clear that collections were actually made by a ryot named Lingareddy, at the instigation of Perinaidu, as well as one Pitchireddy, a very influential ryot in the village. Lingareddy himself admitted that he collected money from certain ryots, giving names and sums in detail, but stated that he returned the money to the respective parties, as

there was no likelihood of the Special Deputy Collector returning to this village from the western villages.

12. That these were the 3 reports your Petitioner submitted to the Collector against Perinaidu, which the Special Deputy Collector seems to have felt as an indirect attack upon his own character. Your Petitioner is at a loss to know what enquiry has, till now, been made by the Collector into these his public reports. Your Petitioner as well as the whole Nellore Taluq were anxiously looking out for the time when enquiry would be set on foot into Perinaidu's ravages in particular, but strange to say, things changed their course. The 3 reports appear to have been lost in oblivion, and on the 3rd day after the submission of Report No. 3, there came out a Takid from the Collector to the great surprise of your Petitioner and the whole Taluq, that he was transferred from the post of Allur Deputy Tahsildar and Submagistrate, an appointment with Revenue and Magisterial powers and sanctioned by Government, to that of Head Vernacular Clerk with no powers whatever. Your Petitioner was not even allowed to remain there, but has been suspended till further orders.

13. That your Petitioner does not, in the least, feel sorry for the charges preferred against him by the Special Deputy Collector, as they could be impartially disposed of on their merits by Your Excellency in council; but he is surprised at the sudden action taken against him by the Collector, who disgraced your Petitioner before ascertaining the truth. First of all, your Petitioner is anxious to know why he should have been transferred to a post with no powers before any enquiry had been made into his conduct. If there was a report against him, why should not his explanation be first taken, and he be then suspended, if the explanation was not satisfactory? why should the Collector have made all appointments before even the commencement of enquiry, i.e., on the very day on which your Petitioner's transfer and suspension were ordered? what motive should have reigned supreme in the mind of the Collector, your Petitioner begs Your Excellency in council to decide. When your Petitioner of 12 years' standing under Government and holding a respectable post, had thus been unnecessarily disgraced before any enquiry into his conduct took place, what guarantee is there that public servants could be safe, even in appointments for which the sanction of government is necessary? If the Collector meant that, to disgrace your Petitioner on a mere report, without taking time to consider on what grounds such report would have been made, was lawful, could it not be lawful for him to depend upon your Petitioner's Public Reports against Perinaidu, a private individual—Reports, not at all the result of unsupported hues of the mob, but the result of regular depositions taken by your Petitioner in his capacity of Deputy Tahsildar of Allur—and take action at once just as he did in your Petitioner's case. If those very ryots, who gave kaifeits against Perinaidu before your Petitioner, were sent for and impartially examined by the Collector, your Petitioner doubts not that Perinaidu's guilt would not only be established, but that something very curious would turn out also against a public servant for whose honesty the Collector has apparently a great regard. Your Petitioner would have brought to light several more irregularities, indulged in by Perinaidu and others, but their good fortune combined with the misfortune of the distressed poor, whom Perinaidu in particular is reported to have deprived of their hard earned money, induced the Collector to adopt no means whatever to punish the really guilty, but to distinguish himself by bagging and disgracing an innocent official, whose useful service during the catastrophe may

well be ascertained from all the distressed ryots of the Allur Division, besides the report of the Salt Deputy Collector, already alluded to.

14. That from the foregoing, your Excellency in council will most assuredly see whether the Special Deputy Collector's reports against your Petitioner were *malicious* or *bonafide*. In a word, the charges against your Petitioner are for the supposed wrongs of a few village officers in the Allur Division. Is it not your Petitioner's misfortune that the Collector should have in the first instance, empowered the Village Officers at the most critical time to use their discretion in the grant of palmyras to the distressed poor, without even fixing a maximum of trees that should be granted, and now amuse himself by holding your Petitioner personally responsible for their acts, and mercilessly recommending to Govt. through the Board of Revenue, to snatch away from your Petitioner, notwithstanding his 12 years' service under Government, his long and hard earned bread? If the Collector did only condescend to see for a moment whether your Petitioner's method of work at the critical time in any way differed from that of his fellow flood superintendents, who are now fortunately in velvet, he would be surprised to find that it was the same throughout. The Special Deputy Collector now comes forward, and makes your Petitioner responsible for the supposed wrongs of the Village Officers in the Allur Division. Your Petitioner now most respectfully asks whether he (the Special Deputy Collector) made himself responsible for the wrongs of those that were under his own superintendence, when he was in charge of southern villages as Tahsildar of the Nellore Taluq during the floods. And has he checked the work of the other fellow superintendents, just as he did your Petitioner's? Do not the Village Officers hold maniams for the work they do under Government, and should they not therefore be held responsible for the wrongs supposed to have been committed by them? Does not the Collector know that the Tank repairs of 4 Villages and Road repairs in 2 localities were entrusted to your Petitioner's care, which occupied a greater part of his time, besides his general inspection and report of several villages in his Division, as well as elsewhere?

15. That in the first place is it now satisfactorily established from the Special Deputy Collector's reports that the Village Officers in the Allur Division granted too many palmyras? Your Petitioner is certain that it is not. It would be seen from the foregoing that the Special Deputy Collector's inspections (of villages) upon which alone the present charges against your Petitioner are based, were very late in February or March i. e. 3 or 4 months after floods & rains; & your Petitioner begs most respectfully to submit why such late inspections of the Special Deputy Collector should be preferred to those of your Petitioner which took place sufficiently early in November i. e. almost immediately after floods. Again, if the Special Deputy Collector, was really of opinion that trees were cut down indiscriminately, he was bound to have disposed of what he thought as surplus by public auction, and was not in the least justified in having ordered palmyra pieces simply to be exposed in public streets to the great detriment of the distressed ryots, and to the immense advantage of rogues, who lost no time in having misappropriated them with impunity.

16. That on the whole, your Petitioner most respectfully submits to Your Excellency in Council that the Government sustained no loss whatever in the grant of trees, by the Village Officers, in the Allur Division, as the Special Deputy Collector himself admits that "in the Allur Division only numerous houses appear to have been affected by extraordinary rains which does not ap-

pear in any other part of the Taluq I am aware of." If the Government are anxious to know where actual loss of Government property has been sustained, it is under the superintendence of the Special Deputy Collector himself, who, as pointed out in para 9 of this Petition, has recommended to the Collector for a complete remission of assessment for the village of Vidavalur, notwithstanding the kaifeits of the Munsiff and karanams before your Petitioner, that the loss of Crops & ca in that village was for Rs. 5000. Although your Petitioner took care to bring this important matter to the notice of the Collector in his Report No. 1 dated 29th March last, no enquiry appears to have as yet been made on the subject, on what grounds your Petitioner cannot venture to submit. Your Excellency in Council could even now profit Government to the extent of Rupees 5000 from this village, if early steps be taken to sift the kaifeits of the village officers & the report of the Special Deputy Collector, besides ordering a regular inspection of fields, if rains have not already set in.

17. That this loss of Government property is not all. If the Government are anxious to learn the actual *loot* of palmyras, your Petitioner would take the liberty to request the attention of Your Excellency in Council not to take the state of affairs of several villages, but one only village—Indukurpett—the state of affairs of several villages, but one only village—Indukurpett—as sample to see what was done under the very Special Deputy Collector, who has now greatly distinguished himself by volleys of charges against your innocent Petitioner. In this village, Indukurpett, it is generally reported that *few* houses were damaged, while the trees that were cut down there and in other villages, by the Munsiff & others of that village, numbered more than a thousand.

18. That these kinds of actual loss of Government property, involving thousands of Rupees which deserve to be rigidly noticed, are kept in the dark, while Your Petitioner's services, which were done in pure *goodfaith*, and in strict conformity with the orders of his superiors, have been exposed to infamy and uncalled—for criticism, besides mercilessly threatening his connexion with the Government service.

19. That the settlement of the Nellore Taluq might perhaps have come to a close by this time, & if the Government will only, for a moment, reflect upon the very liberal remissions that have this year been granted in almost every village, involving nearly loss of a lac of Rupees to Government, in consideration of the hardships to which the ryots were exposed, Your Petitioner doubts not that Your Excellency in Council will not only fully acquit him of all the malicious charges against him, but will also bitterly grieve that your Petitioner, who did very good service during the floods, as reported by the Salt Deputy Collector, was unnecessarily hurled down to a very piteable and deplorable condition.

20. That Your Petitioner has neither yet obtained copy of the Collector's letter to the Board of Revenue recommending his dismissal, nor that of the proceedings of the latter supporting the Collector's recommendation; and he is therefore now unable to submit any explanations touching any remarks the Collector and the Board of Revenue may have made. Your Petitioner, wherefore, most respectfully requests that he may be allowed to do so on obtaining the copies in question.

21. That under all these circumstances, your Petitioner most respectfully submits that the greatest amount of injustice was done to him by the Collector of Nellore by his merciless and uncharitable recommendation of your Petitioner.

*Peti: has failed
see that this
sentence was prominent*

tioner's dismissal from the Government service, notwithstanding his very useful services at the critical time, as recorded by the Salt Deputy Collector in his report to the Collector, which your Petitioner most respectfully requests may be sent for and perused, before finally disposing of his case. Your Petitioner begs to add that the Collector was extremely partial in accepting the Special Deputy Collector's malicious reports against him, although his (Deputy Collector's) malice was as clear as broad day light. Your Excellency in Council may better judge as to what might have been the motive of the Collector in not at all noticing your Petitioner's 3 wellgrounded reports—reports substantiated by the several kaifeits taken from the Village Officers and ryots of 3 villages—against the Special Deputy Collector partly & his favorite, Perinaidu, mostly. Again, Your Petitioner's 3 reports abovementioned, had been prior to those of the Special Deputy Collector against Your Petitioner, and this circumstance is alone sufficient to show that his (Special Deputy Collector's) reports were purely malicious.

22. That, in conclusion, your Petitioner most respectfully requests that your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to take all the above circumstances into kind and impartial consideration, and restore your Petitioner to his post of Allur Deputy Thasildar and Submagistrate, and order the grant of his full pay from the date of his suspension, that is, 3rd May 1875.

That for this act of charity, Your Petitioner shall, as in duty bound,

Ever Pray

Your most obedient

and humble servant.

A. Narasimhachari
late Deputy Tahsildar
of Allur,
Nellore District.

Adams,
Door No. 4, Kondalier Street,
Peddunakki Petah,
Madras.

PETITION NO. 1875.

From Ammanabolu Narasimhachari, late Deputy Tahsildar of Allur, Nellore District.

Dated.

Received.

ABSTRACT.

States within, that the Collector of Nellore has recommended to Government his dismissal from the Government service, for irregularities supposed to have been committed by a few Village Munsiffs in his division, in the grant of palmyras to distressed ryots, during and after the late floods.

2. That, at the critical time, the Collector himself, without fixing a maximum of trees to be granted, specially authorised the Village Munsiffs, to grant, to distressed ryots, a necessary number of palmyras, as the Petitioner was ordered to attend to other important work in the affected villages, such as the superintendence of Tank repairs in 4 villages and Road repairs in 2 localities, besides the general inspection and report of several affected villages.

3. That the manner in which the Petitioner acquitted himself during the critical period, is recorded in high terms in the Salt Deputy Collector's Report to the Collector, which he requests may be sent for and perused.

4. That, while his conduct was so publicly appreciated as to fit him even for better posts, he is sorry to find the Special Deputy Collector making 3 malicious reports against him, containing charges, not only very trivial but also such, as for which he cannot be, in the least, held responsible. The Deputy Collector's charges as well as the Petitioner's explanations thereto, are detailed in 7 clauses of para 7 of this Petition, (which the Petitioner trusts may be patiently perused; as otherwise, he cannot have the remotest chance of success.)

5. That the main charge against him is that too many palmyras were granted in the Allur Division by the village officers, when the number of houses that suffered was small. This charge is utterly ungrounded, as the Special Deputy Collector himself admits in his first report that "in the Allur Division only numerous houses appear to have been affected by extraordinary rains which does not appear in any other part of the Taluq I am aware of." The Petitioner's inspection of damaged houses was in November, while that of the Special Deputy Collector, in February or March, & his charges are based upon this late inspection. The Government may now consider, in the interests of the Petitioner, whether the early or the late inspection is the proper criterion upon which truth can be established. Supposing a larger number of trees were granted, who granted them is the question for the consideration of the authorities. It is evident that the Village Munsiffs granted them under the Special orders of the Collector. The Village Munsiffs hold service maniams, & if they be found to have been too liberal in the grant of trees, as ungroundedly supposed by the Special Deputy Collector, it is just that they should be held responsible, & not the Petitioner, who had nothing to do with the grant of trees, except in 2 exceptional cases, as explained in clauses II and VII, which the Petitioner requests may be patiently perused. The Special Deputy Collector's assumption that too many palmyras were granted by the village officers is unsustainable; for, if his assumption was well grounded, he would have disposed

of by auction there & then, those palmyras pieces which he thought to have been unnecessarily cut down. He has not done so, and his malicious reports against the Petitioner are to be accounted for in a different manner.

6. That the Special Deputy Collector's favorite, by name Perinaidu, was reported to have attempted to collect bribes from ryots of 3 villages, on behalf of the Special Deputy Collector; and the Petitioner, in the interests of the already distressed ryots, did not fail to enquire into the matter, and make 3 wellgrounded reports to the Collector. These 3 reports were felt by the Special Deputy Collector as indirect attacks against him. Hence his malicious reports against the Petitioner. The Collector has been so partial as not at all to have enquired into the Petitioner's public reports, which, if he did, would have brought to light several irregularities perpetrated by Perinaidu, under the very eye, and perhaps at the connivance, of the Special Deputy Collector. The Special Deputy Collector's connivance will be evident from the kaifeit of the Vidavalur Munsiff in which, it is stated that he (the Special Deputy Collector) himself asked him (Munsiff) why he did not give him (Deputy Collector) money, although he sent Perinaidu to his village.

7. That as already submitted, no loss of Government property was at all sustained in the grant of palmyras in the Allur Division; and if the Government are anxious to become acquainted with the actual loss, the Petitioner would most respectfully refer the Government to Vidavalur, (which annually yields upwards of Rupees 10,000,) for which village, the Special Deputy Collector recommended a complete remission of assessment, notwithstanding the kaifeits of the Village Munsiff and kararnams before Your Petitioner, that the loss of crops, on a rough estimate, was only for Rs. 5000. This is not all. The Special Deputy Collector, who feels very sorry for the supposed loss of palmyras in the Allur Division, has himself allowed thousands of trees to be cut down in Indukurpet & other villages, while the number of houses that suffered in that village, was indeed very few.

8. That these kinds of actual loss of Government property, involving thousands of Rupees, which deserve to be rigidly noticed, are kept in the dark, while Your Petitioner's services which were done in pure goodfaith, and in strict conformity with the orders of his superiors have been exposed to infamy and uncalled—for criticism, besides mercilessly threatening his connexion with the Government service.

9. That the Government will, on the whole, see that the Petitioner's 3 reports against the Special Deputy Collector & his favorite, had been prior to those of the Special Deputy Collector against the Petitioner; & the Special Deputy Collector's motive in subsequently reporting against the Petitioner, can be to no other purpose than to cover his own irregularities, the extent of which every one in the Taluq is aware of.

10. That under these circumstances, the Petitioner most respectfully requests that his Petition may be patiently perused, & justice done him by sending for & perusing the Salt Deputy Collector's report abovementioned, & by restoring him to his post of Allur Deputy Tahsildar, & ordering the grant of his full pay from the date of his suspension, i. e., 3rd May 1875.

George
 Wallace
 14th Aug-75
 Transferred to the
 Chief Secretary
 Government
 Hyderabad
 Atchint
 Principal Secretary

malicious reports was
 owing to Peto's having
 forwarded to the Collector
 three reports against the
 acts of one Pevanaidoo, who
 was collecting bribes from
 the distressed ryots on behalf
 of the Deputy Collector, as re-
 munerated in the villages, with
 a promise that liberal re-
 missions would be granted
 in return; that Peto is a
 servant of 12 years standing
 that his worthy services
~~were at the~~ during the
 floods were recorded in
 the report of the Salt
 Deputy Collector to the
 Collector, which may be
 sent for for perusal.

It says that under
 these circumstances, he
 may be reinstated in his

former post of the
 Deputy Saheldar
 of Allur with an
 - years of pay from
 the date of his sus-
 - pension.

Pw S.O. 928/10/75 10/1837

Dept

Collector, the Collector has recommended the dismissal of the pet from the service; that the papers are now before Govt; but that the perusal of the petition, will show that he has been held responsible for acts done by certain village and -rites, who were empowered by the Collector to grant palm-ye trees at their own discretion to the distressed ryots, whose houses were brought down by the floods of Oct. & November last, and that the cause for the Special Deputy Col-

lector's submitting mal-
cious

1897-98
Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 1870 of 1875.

From A. Narasimha
- chary

Occupation. Late Deputy
Tahildar of

Village.

Talook. Allur Division

District. Mallore new
at Madras

Dated 11th } August 1875.

Received 18th }

Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

Brings to notice that
on the malicious report
of the Special Deputy

Collector

Pro. B. of Rev.

Intending letter from Mr. Narasimha Chari, reporting on the
mal-act. Narasimha Chari, Esq. Dy. Tahildar of Allur
Division, Mallore new at Madras

For Orders

Note.

The Board have
summed up the case
against the accused but
is certain points in his
favor appeared not to
have been brought out
this Bureau was prepared
to bring them to notice.

These points are briefly as
follows.

1) that the whole case
rests on the statements of
the Deputy Collector (a Madras)
2) that his letters are
somewhat vindictive in
tone & that his ideas of
what trees were required
are mainly based on what
he saw under after the
floods.

3) that in some cases
there is a want of
satisfactory evidence showing
the number of trees cut

4) that being acting only
it was to his interest to
behave uprightly & that in
the absence of sufficient
motives to urge him to
act incorrectly his conduct
was very probably the
result of misdirected
zeal. Yes

The Collector of Mallore
recommends the
dismissal of his head
Vernacular clerk
Narasimha Chari for
"irregularities committed
by him while acting
as Deputy Tahildar
of the Allur division.

The Board concurs
in the recommendation:
tion for though the
Collector gave no
details they gathered
"from the voluminous
& entirely undigested
documents enclosed
in his letter" that
there had been irregular-
ities and that
"even if he acted

in good faith &
with undirected
zeal he has shown
himself unfit for
any responsible
employment."

2. These irregularities
arose out of an order
issued by the collector
at the time of the
floods in Chellore
last autumn. The
order does not appear
among the papers
so its terms are not
known but according
to the collector's own
letter he issued orders
to the village officers
to grant palmyras,
apparently other woods,
to enable those who
had lost their

I don't think there is
even a doubt that
the order was grossly
abused & that numerous
Chari might have pursued
the abuse & finally I do not
I doubt even reason
in part to make good of
him. & the term of the
official Deputy collector
to him on the 1st of
March a good deal of
time for. For S. S. S. may
be some reason behind
indignation at W.C.
highest. I don't think the
case called for the main
dismissal. but he
is evidently not fit
to be entrusted with the
responsibility of duties of
a Deputy Collector & I do
not think that he
repeated his ordin-
ary of Clerk. L.R.

This is a most unsatisfactory
case and is characterised
by the usual superficiality of
the Collector of Chellore.

The matter is of some
importance & from the Commis-
sioner assumed the character
of a contention between two
rival officers of the District.
For the Special Deputy Collector
is simply a temporarily promoted
Tahsildar - charged with
special duties in which
he one assumed is not
included. He is without
standing in the grade of
Deputy Collector and has
no special commendation
to our confidence. Further
the whole case bears the
impression to my mind of

O. Dorasami, Head-dolar,
but public-servant hunting
prized by Mr. Agnew.

Yet the Collector has taken
no personal part in the matter
whatsoever. So far as one can
gather he has not even
had the defendants before
him. He merely looks at
quantity of Native report
and defence at the Board

houses to rebuild
them." List thereof

were to be furnished
to the Village authorities
at the village auction:

ties were in the
main the responsible
persons in the matter

3. Now Narayana
Chari is charged with
not exercising a proper
check over this wood-
cutting & is even
thought to have
instigated it

The charges were
brought against him
by the Deputy Collector
& are founded mainly
on that officers personal
investigation of the
state of things in
some of the villages
but as pointed out
by the accused the

Deputy Collector's
visits were made
some months after
the disaster when
things had assumed
a very different
appearance.

The accused does
not admit that so
much too much
wood was cut and
says if it was so the
village officers are
primarily responsible,
that he had to trust
to them having hands
including other
work to attend to &
that "the Collector so
far as I was informed
was so particular
with regard to the
safety of Tyote that I
approached my

The Deputy Collector's
estimate is
"more than four times
the sum required
for rebuilding flood
damaged houses."
See para 55 of his letter
of the 10th April 1884.

undisputed & uncontroverted
by any examination of his own.
I agree with Mr. Huddleston
that the Collector's order has
in all probability been abused
and that abuse was not
checked by the Deputy Tahsildar.
But no mala fides transpires
notwithstanding a somewhat
unindistinct prosecution.
And had he not been
practically removed from
his acting office before this
case came up, I should have
been satisfied by a severe
reprimand and would not
have

have supported removal
from even the acting berth.
I would now allow him
to revert to his substantive
appointment without further
reflection.

It is true Dorasamy
Mond, Tahsildar of Gundar
requests his taking duty.
She has already been many
months on special duty & I
would direct Mr. Agnew to
arrange at once for the transmission
of the ordinary work connected with
the floods & through the regular
agency. I would observe that the
Govt. notice with approval
the animadversions of the Board
on the manner in which the Collector
has disposed of the papers. They
would have been justified
in returning them to the Collector
for proper disposal.

Sd/- P. S. S. S.

Gogulapalli
Dampar

WJ

18/9

This case is extremely ill reported
I agree with Mr. Huddleston's view
& would not dismiss the man
from his permanent situation.
He seems very unfit for any
independent charge. WJ

18/9
Dismissal from
Government service
if I did not afford
necessary and timely
aid."

4. In one village "Varilla"
the Deputy Tahsildar
countersigned some
of the orders for
to cut trees & urged
their issue as some
people complained to
him against the
inaction of the village
officers but in the
other cases he does
not seem to have
taken a very active
part - moreover in
some cases the
evidence as to the
amount of wood
cut consists simply
in the amount of
wood which the
Deputy Tahsildar

months afterwards
out of the people's
backyards. His
action seems to have
been very high handed
and his whole letter
has somewhat of a
vindictive tone &
enough to give some
color to the accused's
statement that
he had "enmity"
against him.

5. The accused should
no doubt have
inspected more
thoroughly the
injured houses
but evidently the
pariah & Chucker
hamlets contained
the chief sufferers
& being a Brahmin
he would not enter
these.

see paras ³⁷ 39 & 49 of letter

d: 10th April 75 No 84

see paras 34, 37 & 56

A petitioner who
came for a moment
to admit

state. He issued 2 Vahels
1. directing 20 palungras to
be given for the cattle shed
2. saying that he had been
informed that this man
had lost houses &
should be allowed as
many palungras as he
may require. Some
Brahmins houses were
injured but not apparent
case of the man in question
also the accused says in

16/537
6. With regard to only one
man's case is there any
interested motive
alleged for the Dep. Sudder
action. In this he ordered
trees to be given to a
Brahmin whose cattle
sheds were said to
have been injured.
A report on this case
will be found in paras
2-21 of the Deputy Collector's
letter of the 14th May
75 No 113. The Deputy
Sudder maintains
that the man's shed
was injured, that there
was no order against
granting wood for sheds,
that he gave the order
because he had seen
it & the moonlight &
Kurnum did not live
in the village and
that the man is his
relation of this kind
question of them.

a Daniel Bralun.
His defence is put up
with the Deputy
Collector's letter.

The accused's service
book is not put
up & it cannot be
ascertained how
long he had served
& what has been
thought of him.

He appears to have
been only acting at
Albur & not to have
been there long
& under these circum-
stances it seems
unlikely that he would
have risked his future
prospects for the sake
of getting some paltry
sum from those who
got the wood.

See

Note

Since this was written
he has sent in a printed
petition in which he
gives his whole case
& says his service was
nearly 12 years. The
petition is put up.

See

Case of ...
...
...

No 3184/75

...

No 1537

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 28th October 1875.

Read the following Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue.

McCollin's report on the conduct
of A. Karasimhaiah, ap. 7.
Tahs. of Allur, Nilgiris.

NE.

3rd Aug. 75 No 2158

Note.

This draft was
delayed until it could
be ascertained, with
reference to R.E. Cole,
what had become
of Dorasami, formerly
Kampore, P. P. S. ...

It appears that
he resorted to the
office of ...
31st of July, last, &
that this has been
reported.

...

The Government observe
that there can be no
room for doubt that
the Collector's order
was grossly abused
and that Karasimha
Chari ought to have
prevented the abuse.
But they do not see
sufficient reason to
impute mala fides to

him and consider
that the case is not
such as to call for his
dismissal.

2. It is ordered
however that Narain
Chari is not fit to be
entrusted with the
responsible duties
of a Deputy Tahsildar
& he should revert to
his substantive post
in the office of the
Collector.

3. The Government
notice with disapproval
the crude manner

19
1537
in which the case was
submitted by the
Collector.

4. The Petitioner
will be referred
to the Collector
Sd/-

14. To the Board of Revenue
to the District Officer

f. O.
Case of Warrington
Chari Nello
